

## REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

### Amendments

New claims 17-22 are added dependent from claim 1: claims 17 and 19 are supported at least by Figs. 4-9; claims 18 and 20 are supported at least by the disclosure at page 4 (ln. 25-30); claim 21 is supported at least by the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 and by Figs. 16-18; and claim 22 is supported at least by the disclosure at page 7 (ln. 14-15). No new matter is added.

### Restriction Requirement

In connection with the communication, in which an election was required under 35 U.S.C. 121 among the species depicted in Figs. 4-9 (Group I), the species in Figs. 11-15 (Group II), and the species in Figs. 16-19 (Group III), applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the species in Figs. 4-9 (Group I).

It is believed that all of the pending claims, including those added by this amendment, read on the elected species, except for claim 15 and new claim 21.

Regarding the statement that these Groups have acquired a separate status in the art or a different field of search,

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner **must** examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

MPEP 803 (emphasis added). Thus, according to the MPEP, separate classification is not sufficient if the entire case can be searched at once. In fact, the Office communication does not even support the allegation that separate fields of search are required, or that there are sufficiently numerous subclasses to be searched, or patents in those subclasses, or that searching the entire invention would put any *undue* burden

on the Office. The communication does not set forth where the various species are classified. The sole dependent claim 1 is believed to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.141(a), and so all of the claims in the application should be examined together. Thus, withdrawal of the requirement for an election of species is requested.